

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 701

HE 008 984

AUTHOR Saunders, Nancy; Franklin, Bill
TITLE Departments and Department Chairs: Organizational and Administrative Influences on Undergraduate Teaching. An Annotated Bibliography. On Teaching Undergraduate Sociology.
INSTITUTION American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (\$1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrative Personnel; Administrative Principles; *Annotated Bibliographies; College Administration; *Department Directors (School); Departments; *Educational Administration; *Higher Education; Instructional Program Divisions; Intermediate Administrative Units; Literature Reviews; *Teaching; *Undergraduate Study; University Administration

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography was prepared to aid in an exploration of the ways in which the administrative structure of an institution influences the quality of undergraduate teaching. The specific focus is on the academic department/division and the department/division chair as the crucial administrative unit and administrator. The bibliography contains 35 references, from 1958 through 1975, to articles, dissertations, and books that focus on the organization and administration of departments/divisions in colleges and universities. The references include items for all-level institutions including general information, perceptions of the office, role and functions, selection and evaluation, and role conflicts; the academic organization and administration for all-level institutions; and the academic department/division and the department/division chair for two-year institutions. (JMF)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

APR 28 1977



ED140701

ON TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOLOGY

a project of the american sociological association

DEPARTMENTS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS:
ORGANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE
INFLUENCES ON UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

An Annotated Bibliography

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE008984

DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT CHAIRS: ORGANIZATIONAL
AND ADMINISTRATIVE INFLUENCES ON UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING*

One of the assignments of the Southwest Sub-Task Group of Task Group C is to explore the ways in which the administrative structure of an institution impacts the quality of undergraduate teaching. After much discussion among the sub-task group members, the decision was made to focus specifically on the academic department/division and the department/division chair as the crucial administrative unit and administrator. Preparatory to a pilot survey of department chairs, Ms. Nancy Saunders, Southwest Sub-Task Group member and faculty member at San Antonio College, conducted a literature search to assess the current state of our knowledge and to get some direction for the proposed survey. We are pleased to share the results of this literature search with you in the form of an annotated bibliography. While the bibliography is not exhaustive, the items reflect the current state of our knowledge, or lack of it. Further, the items do not focus specifically on sociology departments/divisions and sociology department/division chairs. Only after systematic study will we be able to specify the severity of this limitation.

This bibliography contains 35 references to articles, dissertations, and books that focus on the organization and administration of departments/divisions in colleges and universities. Most of the references were selected from an ERIC search; others were selected from suggestions of colleagues on the Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology. All items are fully annotated.

The references are organized as follows:

A. All-Level Institutions: The Department Chair

- I. The Department Chair: General
- II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office
- III. The Department Chair: Role and Functions
- IV. The Department Chair: Selection and Evaluation
- V. The Department Chair: Role Conflicts

B. All-Level Institutions: Academic Organization and Administration

- I. Academic Organization and Administration: The Department/
Division
- II. Academic Organization and Administration: General

C. Two-Year Institutions: The Academic Department/Division and
the Department/Division Chair

*Annotations were prepared by Ms. Nancy Saunders, member of Southwest Sub-Task Group, Task Group C, and faculty member, San Antonio College. References were organized and prepared for publication by Bill Franklin, Leader, Task Group C, and Dean, School of Liberal Arts, Southwest Texas State University.

Several items are pertinent to more than one of the foregoing categories. Consequently, each entry is annotated in the first category in which it appears and is referenced in all other appropriate categories.

Annotated Bibliography

A. All-Level Institutions: The Department Chair

I. The Department Chair: General

Brann, J. & Emmet, T.A. (eds.) The academic department or division chairman: a complex role. Detroit, Michigan: Balamp Publishing, 1972.

Much of the relevant literature on department chairmen has been compiled to make this the only book of its kind of recent publication. Topics included are the following: "An Impossible Job About to Become Tougher", "The Department Chairman as Academic Planner", "The University of Utah's Department Chairman Training Program", "Memo to New Department Chairmen", "Relationship of the Department Chairman to the Academic Dean", "On Operational Development: A Theory", "Departments vs. Education", "The Emerging Role of the Department Chairman: Be an Administrative Activist", "Instructional Deans and Chairmen in the Community College: A New Identity Crisis on an Old Theme", "What Do Faculty Want in a Department Chairman?", etc. The book is the most extensive single source available on the department chairman in higher education. The quality of the essays varies greatly. Two of the more substantial pieces are: "The College Department Chairman," by C.H. Heimler, and "The Structure of Academic Administration," by R.J. Henle.

II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office

Edelson, P.J. A descriptive study of the congruence between department chairmen and faculty perceptions of the role of department chairmen in selected collective bargaining and non-collective bargaining private higher education institutions. Dissertation abstracts, 1973, 211-212-A.

Based upon the literature on collective bargaining in higher education, it was hypothesized that: 1) department chairmen in collective bargaining institutions would have more congruent perceptions of the chairman's role than would department chairmen in non-collective bargaining institutions; 2) faculty in collective bargaining institutions would have more congruent perceptions of the chairman's role than would faculty in non-collective bargaining institutions; and 3) there would be greater congruence between department chairmen and faculty perceptions of the chairman's role in collective bargaining institutions than in non-collective bargaining institutions. The instrument used to determine perceptions of the chairman's role included ten factors rated by a jury as the most important job activities performed by department chairmen. Participants in the study were requested to rank-order the job activities in terms of their perceived importance. Instruments were distributed to department chairmen and faculty in matched pairs of unionized and non-unionized, private, liberal arts colleges and universities. The three hypotheses were supported by the study. It was also determined that: 1) the department chairmen in collective bargaining and non-collective bargaining institutions tended to perceive their roles similarly. They tended to see themselves first as department spokesmen and representatives, second as teachers, and third as departmental administrators. 2) Department chairmen in non-collective bargaining institutions tended to perceive their involvement

in administrative activities concerned with coordination and leading activities of the department as less important than did department chairmen in collective bargaining institutions. 3) Department chairmen in unionized and non-unionized schools tended to assign the same importance to teaching. They also tended to rank the liaison activities similarly.

Greene, B.I. The frustration of college professors. Today's Education, 61, February, 1972, 28-29.

The author describes the chairman as the first line administrator that the faculty must see. However, rather than being viewed as a facilitator of instructional processes, Greene sees the chairman as running interference for the dean and believes that the chairman's sole task is insuring that the dean is not embarrassed by departmental activities. "The chairman is the 'no' man; when the dean wants to deny a request, the chairman is the one to do it for him. On the other hand, when the dean wishes to grant a request, he does it." Thus, the role of the department chairman is viewed in a negative manner. If a problem does occur, the faculty member has no real option other than beginning the grievance process with the chairman. However, instead of seeking a solution to the problem, Greene contends that the chairman feels he must defend the administrative position of what has happened. Therefore, when the chairman fails to champion the faculty cause, he has effectively cut off the faculty's legitimate avenue to the redress of a grievance. In conclusion, the author asks that department chairmen not ask faculty to make a mockery of the educational process by over-stressing research and publication to the ignoring of college students and their instructional needs.

Hill, W.W. & French, W.L. Perceptions of the power of department chairmen by professors. Administrative science quarterly, 11, No. 4, March, 1967, 548-574.

The central concerns of this investigation were to develop an instrument for measuring the power of department chairmen as viewed by professors, and to determine whether variations in such perceptions of power were associated with variations in the professional output, perceived productivity, and satisfaction of the departmental faculty. The study also investigated professors' perceptions of the relative influence of various groups in the authority systems of their colleges in order to determine the power position of the chairman relative both to other administrators and to the professors themselves. The sites chosen to test the four hypotheses of this study were five, state-supported, four-year colleges in two western states. The questionnaire developed included 74 items organized in six sections. One section was concerned with the respondent's perceptions of the power of his chairman, the others were concerned with the respondent's satisfaction, his professional output, his estimate of the productivity of his department in comparison to other departments, the relative influence of various groups in the college, and general information about the respondents. A broad definition of power was developed which seemed sufficiently operational to use as a guide: "The power of an individual in a social situation consists of the sanctions others in the situation perceive that he has available to employ in ways that will affect them". Satisfaction was measured by using three questions dealing with the respondent's feelings about his working conditions, about relationships among faculty members, and about faculty-administrator relationships.

Ravetch, H.W. Responsibilities, activities, and attitudes of selected southern california community college department/division chairmen.

The study first identified the range of responsibilities assigned to department/division chairmen in California community colleges. Next, the deans of instruction and selected chairmen and instructors in five Southern California community colleges were asked to respond to an interview guide developed from the list of responsibilities mentioned above. The deans, chairmen, and instructors were asked to identify activities and attitudes of chairmen that they judged to be effective or ineffective in carrying out the chairmen's responsibilities. The parallels and contrasts in the replies of deans, chairmen, and instructors were then analyzed in the study. The research found that the three groups questioned viewed the chairmanship from divergent points of view and provided some significant areas of disagreement such as the following: 1) Deans felt that chairmen should exercise greater supervision over their instructors' professional growth. Chairmen and instructors tended to agree but were reluctant to support direct action. 2) Most deans and chairmen agreed that there should be supervision of the instruction of the individual teacher. Instructors split on the issue, but many were vehemently opposed. 3) Deans did not feel that chairmen were effective change agents. Chairmen, however, judge themselves to be effective in this area, and instructors overwhelmingly agreed. 4) Deans saw chairmen primarily as educational leaders; instructors saw them as office managers; chairmen saw themselves both as managers and liaison between instructors and administrators. Despite these divergent viewpoints, there were also significant areas of agreement among the three groups. 1) The chairman was not considered to be a recruiter, a counselor, or an institutional researcher. 2) The chairman was considered to be a resource person, a representative of the faculty, a communicator, a human relations expert, a manager, and an evaluator. 3) Previous training or experience in the chairmanship may not be necessary. The pressure of the position is seen as providing its own crucible for forging effective chairmen. 4) The chairman must hear and represent the faculty, but he must not be "ridiculously democratic". While constantly consulting with his instructors, he must still be decisive and lead them in a meaningful direction. 5) The administrator-instructor dualism of the chairmanship is recognized and resolved not through debate but through acceptance. The chairman must operate in both spheres and harmonize them. 6) The chairman should be given expanded authority, especially in the areas of hiring, evaluation, and budget control.

Satlow, I.D. Common gripes of teachers about their chairmen. The journal of business education, 44, No. 3, December, 1968, 108-110.

Although the author does not comment on the level of education reported in this article, the reader inferred that the chairmen mentioned were secondary departmental chairmen. However, the complaints mentioned may have applicability to chairmen in universities and colleges. Basically, the complaints fell into eight categories. 1) Lack of consideration by the chairmen for the problems of the faculty. 2) Inequitableness - The chairmen would often select the most desirable courses for themselves and give the next most desirable to the faculty members favored by the chairmen, and the poor classes to everyone else in the department. 3) Inflexibility - This trait manifested itself in a rigidity of viewpoints as to the standards of expectancy and the methods to be employed in the teaching of topics. 4) Disinterestedness - The chairmen are not interested in the faculty and their problems, and as a consequence the faculty are left with no one to turn to for guidance. 5) Lack of courage - The teachers condemned the chairmen's lack of fortitude

in dealing with decisions that called for the exercise of leadership or for problems with the administration. 6) Isolation - The chairmen can seldom be found or appears to be too busy for consultation. 7) Lack of professionalism - Many teachers claimed that the chairmen are stagnating, failing to keep pace with new developments in content, materials, and teaching methods. 8) Personality - The personality gripes were typically those that could be directed against people in any type of work and are not viewed as being confined to departmental chairmen.

Smith, A.B. Department chairmen: neither fish nor fowl. Junior college journal, 42, March, 1972, 40-43.

The study reported was an attempt to arrive at a consensus regarding the chairman's job activities in twelve Michigan colleges. The lack of a clear definition of the chairman's role appeared to be a major problem confronting community colleges. Department chairmen wanted and needed role clarification. One of the major purposes of the investigation was to determine what the faculty members, chairmen, and upper echelon administrators expected for inclusion in the research by means of a stratified random sampling plan. A questionnaire was developed which contained 46 job activity statements that were believed to be important job responsibilities for chairmen to perform. All of the faculty members, chairmen, and upper echelon administrators were sent a questionnaire in the sample colleges. The major findings concerning expectations were presented in the article in six functional categories which follow: 1) production, 2) maintenance, 3) boundary: production supportive, 4) boundary: institutional supportive (example: Faculty members believed that chairmen have an obligation to seek larger shares of college funds for their departments. Chairmen and upper echelon administrators attach less importance to this supportive activity.) 5) adaptive (example: According to all groups, chairmen have the "highly" essential obligation to develop long range departmental goals and to plan for future departmental equipment need.) 6) managerial. The authors recommended that community colleges adopt for all their chairmen's roles those job activities which received more than 90 percent positive response from chairmen, faculty, and upper echelon administrators.

Stull, W.A. An exploratory study of the role of division chairmen in the Virginia community college system. Dissertation abstracts, 1974, 224-225-A.

The primary purposes of the study were to 1) provide a detailed description of the essential characteristics of division chairmen; 2) determine the role of division chairmen as perceived by chairmen, their deans, and their faculty; 3) determine if differences in role perception exist among chairmen, their deans, and their faculty; 4) determine if differences in role perception exist among chairmen from small, medium, and large community colleges; 5) determine what relationships currently exist between the actual and ideal role of division chairmen; and 6) determine the degree of division chairman satisfaction on selected job elements. Each purpose was restated in research question form and three questionnaires designed to provide descriptive answers to these questions were distributed to 81 division chairmen, 115 faculty, and 20 deans in sixteen of Virginia's community colleges. The following findings appear to be representative of the study: 1) All reference groups identified the following activities as those upon which they perceived chairmen currently placing major emphasis: (a) establishing and maintaining a working relationship with faculty; (b) assigning faculty teaching loads; (c) listening to faculty problems and complaints relative to the division and the college; (d) interacting with the administration on the behalf of the division; (e) making recommendations for salary increments, promotions,

etc.; (f) recruiting, screening, and interviewing prospective faculty; and (g) preparing division reports, routine paper work and other general administrative duties. 2) All reference groups identified the following activities as those upon which they perceived chairmen placing major emphasis in the future: (a) establishing a working relationship with faculty; (b) providing informal faculty leadership; (c) maintaining morale among faculty; (d) listening to and encouraging ideas to improve the functioning of the division; (e) evaluating the institutional programs offered by the division. 3) Differences in role perception were found to exist among reference groups for both actual and ideal role of division chairmen. A greater number were found to exist for actual role than for ideal role. 4) College size appeared to have little effect on chairmen's perception of their actual or ideal role.

Turner, K.S. The administrative role of the department chairman in florida public community colleges. Dissertation abstracts, 1973.

The procedures used to carry out the research in this report were based upon a three-pronged investigation of the problem: library research, content analysis of the policy manuals of Florida public community colleges, and survey analysis of the perceptions of department chairmen and academic deans. All 368 department chairmen and the 32 academic deans from the 28 Florida community colleges were surveyed. The review of the literature revealed that the organizational structure experienced in most colleges and universities including Florida community colleges, was hierarchical and scalar, with the department chairman as "first level" or "middle manager" in the organization. The content analysis of the policy manuals determined that 11 out of 28 colleges completely detailed the expected role of the department chairman. Five did not include the department chairman in their policy manual. The listings of the duties and responsibilities of the department chairman produced a "laundry list" of unrealistic items which were a source of role conflict. Of the 11 colleges that delineated duties, administrative activity was mentioned more frequently than teaching. The policy manuals were ambiguous as to the administrative and teaching role of the department chairmen, thus adding to the role conflict experienced by chairmen. The questionnaires revealed few significant differences between the perceptions of the chairmen and deans. In "actual" conditions, the respondents perceived the department chairmen to be administratively oriented and thought that they should be more oriented in "ideal" conditions. Chairmen at large colleges perceived themselves to be more administratively oriented than those at small colleges.

Washington, E.M. The relationship between college department chairpersons' leadership style as perceived by teaching faculty and that faculty's feelings of job satisfaction. Dissertation abstracts, 1975, 3464-A.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether faculty job satisfaction is affected by faculty perceptions of the department chairperson's leadership style. In addition, the study was conducted to determine whether faculty job satisfaction is affected by the method by which department chairpersons are selected. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, (LBDQ), was used to determine a college department's perception of its chairperson's leadership style. A faculty member was asked to respond to statements which described the behavior of his department chairperson. The LBDQ delineated leadership style into two classifications, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure referred to the leader's behavior in delineating relationships between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization. Consideration referred to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, and warmth between the leader and members of his group. Job satisfaction was assessed by using

two separate instruments. The Brayfield-Rothe index, primarily designed for business and industry, asked the respondent to indicate the degree to which he was happy with his job. The other instrument was developed from a survey of related literature on college faculty. It asked the respondent to indicate the degree to which he was actually involved and the degree to which he felt that he should be involved in decision making in his department. The degree of job satisfaction was determined by the amount of discrepancy between real and actual involvement. The conclusions of the study were the following: 1) The degree of job satisfaction was highest in college academic departments when the faculty perceived that its chairperson's leadership style was high in initiating structure and high in consideration. 2) The degree of faculty job satisfaction was highest when faculty were allowed to select their chairperson.

Zucker, J.D. A model for determining the role perceptions of department chairmen at a large university. Dissertation abstracts, 1973.

The following questions were investigated in this study: 1) what are the dimensions of a model to determine the role perceptions of department chairmen at a large university? 2) What are the results of applying the model to the role perceptions of department chairmen at a large university? The study was conducted in three phases: 1) a model for determining the role perceptions of department chairmen at a large university was developed; 2) a questionnaire, based on the dimensions of the developed model, was constructed and administered to department chairmen at the University of Florida; 3) the results of model questionnaires were presented and analyzed for the university as a whole and for individual colleges. The study found that department chairmen at the University of Florida seemed to be persons committed to the goals of their departmental associates. Also, the chairmen saw themselves as powerful administrators who must contend with difficult higher-level administrators who keep disturbing their knowledgeable functioning with unnecessary calls for information. The University of Florida department chairmen saw their main tasks to be those of recruiting faculty, staff, and developing programs, improving instruction, evaluating faculty and staff, and preparing the departmental budget. The chairmen thought of returning to the world of research and instruction, yet they seemed more satisfied with the personal rewards of the position they held.

III. The Department Chair: Role and Functions

Buhl, L.C. & Greenfield, A. Contracting for professional development in academe. Educational record, 56, No. 2, Spring, 1975, 111-121.

According to Buhl and Greenfield, institutional environments largely determine whether faculty members find it worthwhile to devote their time to increasing learning effectiveness, as opposed to research and publications. By clearly stating their expectations for faculty performance and by understanding the faculty members' personal/professional goals, chairpersons can organize support for professional development in teaching that can change the organization significantly. Thus, the faculty members become trained and rewarded for making serious sustained and documented efforts to improve their teaching. Specifically, contracts are developed with the principles of Management by Objectives (MBO) in mind. In essence, the personal/professional objectives of the employee are matched to the objectives of the organization through the mediation of the middle-level managers (the chairperson), and the agreement is clearly stated in written form and approved by both parties. Support and feedback is given by the chairperson throughout the year, and

plan of standard operating procedures; and some areas which should receive further research. Two recommendations for further research were 1) to determine the annual rate of turnover for departmental chairmen and why they resign their positions, and what the rate of turnover would be if chairmen were paid an adequate stipend above their regular salary; 2) to determine how students, departmental faculty, and other college administrators perceive the role of the chairman.

Quick, W.R. The university departmental chairman: his role in patterns of faculty selection, promotion, and termination. Dissertation abstracts, 1966, 3273-A.

The purpose of this dissertation was to discover, gather, and systematically analyze theoretical and empirical information from interdisciplinary sources which were conceptually related to the problem; thereby revealing faculty interaction patterns of behavior which sooner or later may occur in the role of the departmental chairman in a university system. The descriptive method was selected because it was thought that a greater yield of epistemological knowledge would be made available to the reader, especially the departmental chairmen. The dissertation problem was stated in the form of three questions with findings such as the following: Question a) What interdisciplinary research has been done in higher education relative to the topic? 1. The study of the role of the chairman is more neglected than any other university administrator. 2. Inherent stress is brought to bear on the chairman as he actively participates, either formally or informally, in faculty selection, promotion, or termination. 3. Before acting, the chairman seriously takes into account what his peer groups may think about his anticipated action. Question b) Relative to the freedom-authority dilemma, can the chairman expect to function in a university environment which is structurally and functionally similar to (1) a hierarchy, (2) a community of scholars, (3) a symbiotic community? 1. The department chairman can expect to function in either of the three communities but most likely will function in a symbiotic community structure where elements of both (1) and (2) are manifested. 2. National authorities disagree intensively on whether or not the university is a hierarchy. 3. There is a trend in the symbiotic university community toward a more powerful formally oriented department. Question c) Is some kind of formal professional academic in-service training needed by department chairmen? 1. There is such a need. 2. There are few if any sources to which the chairman may turn in order to become aware of patterns which are expected to develop in his role as chairman.

Ravetch, H.W. Responsibilities, activities, and attitudes of selected southern california community college department/division chairmen. Dissertation abstracts, 1972, 5522-A. [See II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Stull, W.A. An exploratory study of the role of division chairmen in the virginia community college system. Dissertation abstracts, 1974, 224-225-A. [See II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Turner, K.S. The administrative role of the department chairman in florida public community colleges. Dissertation abstracts, 1973. [See II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Waltzer, H. The job of academic department chairman: experience and recommendations from miami university. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975.

when an evaluation is due, it is geared to the extent to which the goals have been achieved. The chairperson, therefore, must develop the skills necessary to define departmental goals with reference to those of the institution and to translate them clearly and systematically to the members of the department.

Koehnline, W.A. & Blocker, C.E. The division chairman in the community college. Junior college journal, 40, February, 1970, 9-12.

While the departmental organization may be appropriate in universities and long-established colleges, the authors of this article question its usefulness in community colleges. They believe the most effective operational units are divisions, and the key to the success of the program is in the position of the division chairman. The academic division in a community college is larger and more diversified than a traditional department. Because of the breadth of his responsibilities, the division chairman cannot function primarily as a subject-matter specialist. Therefore, the authors provide a very detailed description of the types of responsibilities of the division chairman such as preparing schedules, initiating divisional budget request, supervising the design of new curricular offerings, etc. The authors contend that the divisional chairman should not be viewed primarily as a scholar, but as a leader of a teaching faculty.

Nigro, P.D. Changing managerial concepts at the university. Journal of business education, 49, November, 1973, 75-76.

According to the author, where union contracts exist in higher education, fewer faculty members wish to step forward and accept the title of supervisor. Therefore, the chair is harder to fill, for the task of chairman has become more difficult to define. Under the industrial rules of warfare, brought over and incorporated into the typical campus contract, the potential department head now will face an almost insurmountable dilemma. By virtue of the historical realities of conflict, the chairman can no longer act solely as a "group leader". He must act as a directing manager scrupulously enforcing the negotiated production practices or face replacement. In effect, he has to settle production disputes within the framework of managerial "prerogatives". The author is convinced that if scholars, both in academic management and in the classroom, value the university system, negotiations must be more imaginative in drawing up new contracts and perhaps drastically break with the industrial model.

O'Grady, J.P. The department chairman. Improving college and university teaching, 21, Autumn 1973, 270-272. The same research is also reported in The role of the department chairman. Junior college journal, 41, February, 1971, 33-36.

This study of selected Missouri and Illinois two-year colleges had two major purposes: 1) to ascertain the role exercised by departmental chairmen in selected small and large two-year colleges; and 2) to make a comparison between the roles of the chairmanship in small and large two-year colleges. A checklist of probable aspects of the role exercised by the departmental chairman was field tested and served as a guide in directing the questions of the open-ended personal interviews. The major findings concerning the two-year college departmental chairmen were presented by six categories as follows: status of the departmental chairman's role, chairman's qualifications, budget administration, personnel administration, academic administration, and general functions of the chairmanship. The study suggested recommendations of two types: some procedures which should be incorporated into the institutional

This is the report of a study of the job of academic department chairman conducted at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. The author attempts to describe the job as it is at Miami and to provide some frank evaluations of the problems that the job entails. He addresses the changes that have recently occurred in the job, the time allotted to perform the job, preparation or the lack of it for the position, and the incentives and rewards associated with the chairing a department. The report concludes with some specific recommendations for alleviating some of the difficulties identified.

IV. The Department Chair: Selection and Evaluation

Corson, J.J. The governance of colleges and universities: modernizing structure and processes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

In Chapter 13 entitled "Leadership in the College and University", Corson states "the role of departmental chairpersons varies as the departments they are expected to lead vary." Therefore, Corson sees the selection of the department chairman frequently based on factors such as teaching ability or seniority of the individual as seen by colleagues rather than on any demonstrated capacity for administrative leadership. The static chairperson sees to it that the necessary activities are taken care of; the leader-like chairperson, striving to enhance the reputation of the department, does more. Such a chairperson strives to stimulate his colleagues to enrich course offerings, encourages innovations in teaching methods, and attempts to recruit the best qualified persons for teaching positions. He helps his colleagues obtain grants to support their research and to provide aid for graduate students. Most importantly, the department chairperson represents his colleagues in discussions with the dean and other administrative officials. Most department chairpersons are expected to discharge these leadership responsibilities while subject to a variety of handicapping constraints. Additionally, the power of the chairperson is strengthened only as his stature with the administration grows and as his colleagues recognize his ability to lead.

Ehrle, E.B. Selection and evaluation of department chairmen. Educational record, 56, No. 1, Winter 1975, 29-38.

The article sets forth a procedures used in the selection an evaluation of department chairmen at Mankato State College. The process used occurs in five steps. 1) Setting the ground rules. As soon as a vacancy occurs, the deans requests a meeting of the department to discuss with the faculty the ground rules for selecting a new chairman. Agreements are reached on whether there should be an inside, outside, or mixed slate of candidates. The requirements of affirmative action regarding women and minority candidates are to be understood by the faculty. Student input is also sought at this point. 2) Involving the other chairmen. As soon as three persons are nominated for the position of chairman, an advisory panel is appointed from among the department chairmen of the entire school. 3) Involving the other deans. Because some departments conduct programs that cross school boundaries, deans who would be concerned with the position of the new chairman advise the dean who is in the process of selecting the new person. 4) The recommendation. The dean makes his recommendation to the academic vice-president with an accompanied written report of the departmental findings, the written opinions of the panel of chairmen, and a summary of all the types of advice received. 5) The announcement. The announcement of the appointment of a new department chairman is made first to the faculty of the department and then to both on-campus and off-campus news media. Finally, Ehrle suggested that evaluation of department chairmen be conducted every three years. The purpose of such

an evaluation is to assist the chairmen in their professional development as leaders of the departments. The evaluation should include a self-evaluation, an evaluation by the departmental faculty, and an evaluation by the dean. At the discretion of the dean, it might also include peer evaluation by other chairmen. The article provides very specific details and a timetable to be used in carrying out such an evaluation.

Freligh, E.A. An investigation of the qualifications, methods of selection, and terms of office of department and division chairmen in selected public two-year colleges in the United States. Dissertation abstracts, 1973, 2959-A.

Since the selection of the chairman may be an expression of expectations regarding his role, questions were included in this survey on the chairman's role, his status, whether he is identified primarily as faculty or administration, and collective bargaining as it affects selection of chairmen. Respondents were also invited to identify current practices, their advantages and disadvantages, and to recommend "ideal" qualifications, selection methods, and terms. University-branch, multi-campus, and single-campus institutions were selected for large enrollment, high proportion of full-time faculty, and membership in or contact with the League for Innovation in the Community Colleges. Respondents included campus chief executives, academic deans, chairmen, and faculty. Though data were tabulated by computer, only descriptive analysis was used. Findings appear to indicate clearly that leadership at the chairmanship level is highly important to teaching institutions such as the community college, that administrative support of the chairmanship (i.e., with time, money, or secretarial help) has not matched the high regard administrators claim to feel, that qualifications and methods of selection are neither clearly defined nor consistently practiced even on the same campus, that multi-campus and single-campus community colleges differ markedly in virtually all aspects of the chairmanship, and that faculty, chairmen, and administrators all experience frustration with the somewhat indefinable role, quality, function, and central importance of the two-year college chairmanship.

Kiernan, I.R. The new style in college administration? Junior college journal, 38, September, 1967, 22-23.

The article reports on the 1967 Conference on the Nature and Demands of Teaching in Two-Year Colleges held at Bennet College at which participants seriously considered the process of evaluation of administrators. The author discussed the need for evaluation of department chairmen and deans by the faculty and provided practices which might be adopted by institutions.

Mobley, T.A. Selecting the department chairman. Educational record, 52, No. 4, Fall 1971, 321-327.

The author contends that it is the chairman who "hold the line responsibility". He or she is the pivot or middleman at the point where administration most directly contacts the faculty, and therefore, the chairman is the key to the success or failure of the departmental program. Additionally, the character, status, and functions of department heads or chairmen seem to influence the choice of selection method. Although much has been written about the department and the work of the chairman, Mobley finds little written concerning selection. According to the author, the status of the chairman is frequently dictated by the manner in which he became chairman. If the department executive officer is designated a departmental "head" by the administration, he must maintain administrative allegiance while cultivating faculty confidence.

If he is a "chairman" whose source of power is the faculty, he must maintain this source while developing the confidence of the administration. In maintaining this dual confidence, the chairman must be sufficiently democratic to please the faculty, yet decisive and consistent enough to achieve results and obtain mutual faculty and administrative goals. The author has identified six selection methods that form the basis for almost all other combinations and provided ample discussion of the advantages and disadvantages inherent in each system. 1) The dean appoints a department head who usually serves for life or until the dean chooses to make a change. There is no input by the department faculty, and there is a strong possibility that they may not support the dean's choice. 2) The second method provides for appointment of the chairman by the dean after he confers privately with each faculty member in the department. The dean still makes the final appointment, and there is no assurance that he will interpret accurately the wishes of the faculty majority. 3) The dean may appoint a selection committee to search for and screen candidates. The committee then makes recommendations to the dean. If one of these recommendations is not acceptable to the dean, he may request additional recommendations from the committee. 4) A committee elected by the faculty makes recommendations to the dean, from which he makes a selection. 5) The chairman is elected by the department faculty. The dean then has the option to approve or disapprove the elected chairman. 6) The final method for the selection of the chairman differs from the fifth procedure only in that there is no provision for review or veto by the dean. Thus, the faculty role is strengthened and the dean's role is virtually eliminated. The author concludes the article with a discussion of five basic principles, continually emphasized in both the literature and interviews which he felt should be inherent in any procedure for selecting the department chairman. 1) There must be formalized and meaningful faculty involvement in the selection of the department chairman. 2) Concurrently, there must be opportunity for the dean to appoint a chairman with whom he can develop a sound working relationship. 3) There should be a term of office or periodic review for the chairman with the provisions for reappointment. 4) Students majoring in the department should be involved in the selection of the department chairman. However, the extent of involvement will vary between universities. 5) An atmosphere of mutual trust and honesty based on good communications is an essential element in all human relations and particularly at all levels of university administration.

Smith, G. (Ed.) In search of leaders. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

Chapter 10, "Departmental Chairman", by David Fellman, pp. 240-243, provides a general overview of the role of the department chairman, selection of the chairman, and length of time the chairman will serve. The author feels that the principle of annual review provides solid protection against the tyranny of an entrenched chairman. Chapter 11, "Departmental Leadership in the Two-Year College", by Richard Richardson, Jr., pp. 244-248. The author contends that while there is considerable information available on the department chairman in the four-year institution, the information on the junior college department chairman is extremely lacking. In spite of protests of uniqueness, there is much evidence to support the view that junior colleges look to their four-year counterparts to serve as at least points of departure for their own organizational and curricular patterns. However, the author does provide the major points of differences between four and two-year departments. 1) Traditionally, many junior colleges have begun as upward extensions of the secondary school, frequently sharing a common board. Although the trend is away from this type of control, the indelible mark of

the organizational structure remains. 2) A second related factor involves the tendency of two-year colleges to draw upon the secondary school for administrative and teaching staff. The major result of this secondary school influence has been to decrease the faculty member's interest and desire for active involvement in a department form of organization and to increase administrative domination. 3) A third factor is the less well-defined orientation toward a specific discipline. However, the author feels that there is a movement to counteract this process in the emerging role of the faculty in policy formation. Finally, the author sees the major difference between two and four-year colleges to be the greater likelihood that the chairman will be appointed and hold office at the pleasure of the administration in the two-year institution. The article concludes with suggestions for the selection and term of junior college chairmen.

V. The Department Chair: Role Conflicts

Carrol, A.B. Role conflict in academic organizations: an exploratory examination of the department chairman's experience. Educational administration quarterly, 10, Spring 1974, 51-64.

This study reports the results of an empirical study of the role conflict experienced by university department chairmen. The investigation focused on the existence, frequency, and kinds of role conflict experienced by the chairmen. The data for the study were gathered through use of a mailed research instrument to members of a random sample. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to record data regarding personal attributes of the department chairmen and selected organizational dimensions. For example, the number of years the respondent had been a chairman, his age, the size of the department, his academic rank, etc. The second part of the instrument was the role conflict index. The third part of the instrument was a modification of the need satisfaction questionnaire developed by Lyman Porter. The fourth section was designed to elicit from the chairmen their rankings of perceived role conflict with respect to six key decision areas. It was demonstrated that the role conflict problem does indeed manifest itself within the academic organization, and it was determined that the highest conflict decisions were those involving faculty salary and faculty promotions.

Ravetch, H.W. Responsibilities, activities, and attitudes of selected southern california community college department/division chairmen. Dissertation abstracts, 1972, 5522-A. [See II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Stull, W.A. An exploratory study of the role of division chairmen in the virginia community college system. Dissertation abstracts, 1974, 224-225-A. [See II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Upton, J.H. Role conflict and faculty confidence in leadership. Junior college journal, 41, February, 1971, 28-31.

In view of the current unrest in higher education between faculties and governing boards, a study was completed on faculty and trustee expectations about the role of the community college president. A sample of colleges having 20 to 100 full-time instructors were studied. Board members, faculty members, and presidents constituted the three major respondent groups. Faculty and board members were found to vary significantly in their expectations of fourteen of thirty-one types of performances. Additionally, an effort was made to determine whether intergroup differences in expectations for

the performance of the president were related to factors such as size of institution, extent of differences between groups in their expectations for division of responsibilities, effectiveness of the president as perceived by board members, and job satisfaction and confidence in the organization as reported by members of the faculty group. While no relationship was found between amount of role conflict and the faculty job satisfaction, faculty in low-conflict institutions consistently reported greater confidence in the leadership of the organization. In those institutions where board-faculty differences were lowest, faculty members had more confidence in the leadership of the organization than did faculty members in institutions where board-faculty differences were greatest. Finally, colleges with low conflict were predominately small relative to those with high conflict. This finding is consistent with another study by Astin who found that large institutions are more prone to unrest.

Waltzer, H. The job of academic department chairman: experience and recommendations from miami university. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1975. [See III. The Department Chair: Role and Functions.]

Woodburne, L.S. Principles of college and university administration. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Chapter 7 entitled "Departmental Administration" provides an overview of the departmental structure in colleges and universities. The author noted the disjunction which occurs among departments which are striving for different end results and objectives without realizing that these are different goals from those of their fellow units or different from the goals of the institution. In dealing with the functions of an executive officer, Woodburne states the primary concern of the department chairman should be the appointments of faculty, the promotions, the budget, the salaries, the tenure decisions, and the assignment of staff to the teaching duties which they can do best. Seldom in the modern college or university is the department head able to start without any precedents and to develop both the curricular program and the faculty for a department from the very beginning. In most instances, he comes into a department which already has a considerable historical background, in which the staff is, to a great extent, already determined, and in which he will have to work within some of these limitations. A faculty member before accepting a position as department head should have sufficient understanding of the problems of the department so that he will know the circumstances under which his appointment is made with respect to his ability to carry out any effective changes if such changes are needed.

B. All-Level Institutions: Academic Organization and Administration

I. Academic Organization and Administration: The Department/Division

Anderson, K.J. The ambivalent department. Educational record, 49, No. 2, Spring 1968, 206-213.

The author traces the evolution of the much-maligned department from its medieval origins to the present. While acknowledging the arguments of its critics, Anderson presents evidence indicating that the department's advantages and potential value as a basic administrative unit far outweigh its defects. Additionally, some attention is given to the role of the department chairperson. The author indicates that "if the chairperson is to act like an administrator, he should be treated like a first class administrator by providing him with adequate supporting services, information and equipment, reduction of his teaching load, and examining the need for oppressive committee assignments."

Blomerley, P. The junior college department and academic governance. Junior college journal, 41, February 1971, 38-40.

This article is based on a study which was designed to assess the role of junior college faculty in decision making at the departmental level. Data were gathered from eight public two-year colleges in New York State in order to determine the status of the department in the organizational structure and the relationship between the degree of faculty influence and two other variables, faculty morale and departmental objectives. After four departments had been selected at random from each of the eight colleges, the department chairmen were interviewed about their responsibilities, the role of their departments in decision making, and the involvement of faculty at the departmental level. Subsequently, a questionnaire was prepared and mailed to each faculty member in the departments under study to ascertain their perceptions of the relative influence of the chairman and the faculty in areas of decision, departmental morale, and the objective of their departments. Departmental faculty members as a group tended to have more influence in those matters which were closely related to teaching, curriculum decisions for example, while chairmen were more influential than their faculty colleagues in personnel matters and in other areas which affect working conditions in the department. The results of this study suggest that faculty members are more concerned about their involvement in decisions which affect their working context than with faculty prerogatives in other areas. They further suggest that such involvement would positively affect professorial morale without any erosion of departmental objectives.

Dressel, P.L., Johnson, F.C., & Marcus, P.M. The confidence crisis: an analysis of university departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1970. Also discussed in an article based on the book, Departmental operations: the confidence game. Educational record, 50, No. 3, Summer 1969, 274-278.

The book and article are based on a study of operations for more than 100 departments and associated units at 15 universities. During the study it became apparent that it was necessary to pay very careful attention to the "influence processes" within the department and between the department and other administrative units within the university. The "confidence game" discussed by the authors is not in itself undesirable. For in some form, it is inevitable, for "confidence" is a key concept in the success of a department. The good department has confidence in itself and in the university. This confidence is reciprocated, and the department enjoys autonomy and support. Under these circumstances, the department that lacks confidence in its own worth is often beset with internal strife. The conclusions reached from the study are the following: 1) Autonomy is essential to effective departmental operation, but autonomy is meaningless without adequate resources which, in turn, are dependent upon the existence of both departmental self-confidence and confidence reciprocated among the departments, the dean, and the university. The relationships among faculty, departmental executives, and the systematic treatment of substantive issues. 2) The confidence game is a central element in university operations. The winners of the game are those departments with the financial resources, the equipment, facilities, and autonomy necessary to support and reward the faculty members for those activities in which they wish to engage. 3) The outcomes of the confidence game are not always in the best interest of higher education. The authors believe new rules and a different concept of "winning" are required, for what is regarded as good by the department is not always best for the institution or for higher education.

II. Academic Organization and Administration: General

Baldrige, J.V. & Deal, T.E. (Eds.) Managing change in educational organizations: sociological perspectives, strategies, and case studies. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975.

The articles in this volume concern change and innovation at the primary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Some are reports of empirical research, others are speculative, and still others are case studies of both successful and unsuccessful attempts at educational innovation. Several of the papers focus on organizational and administrative influences on change efforts. The following titles are illustrative: "Organizational Influences on Educational Innovation," "Rules for a Machiavellian Change Agent: Transforming the Entrenched Professional Organization," and "Effects of Environment and Structure on the Process of Innovation."

Bok, Derek. On the purposes of undergraduate education. Daedalus, Fall 1974, 159-172.

The author of the article feels that our colleges continue to exist without making an effort to define their aims, and therefore he discusses the major purposes he feels should be ascribed to the liberal arts college. He describes the following contributions of lasting value that a liberal arts education can provide for its students and, ultimately, for the society as well: 1) acquiring information and knowledge, 2) acquiring skills and habits of thought, 3) developing qualities of mind such as open-mindedness, a respect for other points of view, etc., 4) acquiring understanding and competence in the arts, and 5) developing judgment and values. According to Bok, college administrations have carried out very little serious research to help evaluate and improve the quality of undergraduate education. To the author any serious attempt to use research in improving the quality of education must include an effort to identify the effects of educational programs on the student. Although such research is difficult even under the best of circumstances, it should be attempted. The author feels strongly that university professors who cannot articulate convincingly the ultimate aims of undergraduate teaching will fail not only in persuading students, parents, and legislators of the worth of what they do, but may fail even to persuade themselves.

Fleming, R.W. The administration of good teaching. The center for research on learning and teaching, University of Michigan, No. 36, August, 1969.

The issue reports the views of seven administrators from the University of Michigan on the problem of the interaction between research and teaching in the large university. Several contributors focused their articles on the need for evaluation of teaching with suggestions for carrying out departmental evaluation processes. Allan F. Smith contends that research tends to be emphasized in recruiting and evaluation simply because the nature of the data are more tangible and less subjective than teaching data. Other authors discuss the need in higher education to recognize that the ideal faculty member is one who is highly competent in both teaching and research. As an outgoing chairman, Marvin Eisenberg concludes the series of articles by advocating a rotating chairmanship on the premise that the longer a chairman stays out of the classroom--or even reduces his concern with teaching on the various levels of instruction--the less realistic becomes his evaluation of problems and qualifications of the teacher.

Gross, E. Universities as organizations: a research approach. American sociological review, 33, No. 4, August, 1968, 518-544.

This paper provides a test of the usefulness of a formal organizational model in studying the structure of universities. Nondenominational universities in the United States were researched by sending mail questionnaires to administrators and faculty members. The findings reported concerned goals, their relation to the power structure and to other characteristics of universities. There was consensus on the part of administrators and faculty on what the goals "are" and on what they "should be". According to both faculty and administration, the highest goal "should be" protecting the faculty's right to academic freedom. Most of the top goals were supportive goals rather than output goals, and only one of them involved students. Protecting academic freedom was more emphasized as a goal in private than in state universities. In the former, the goals revolve around student-expressive matters, but the latter are more likely to emphasize preparing students for useful careers, assisting citizens through extension, and doing applied research. Student expressive goals are also related positively to the prestige of the institution, whereas emphasis on student instrumental goals and undergraduate instruction were related negatively to prestige. The biggest difference in goal structures arose where legislatures and state governments were perceived as having greater power relative to administrators and faculty.

Ikenberry, S.O. Governance and the faculty. Junior college journal, 42, November, 1971, 12-14.

The aim of the article was to enumerate at least a few of the apparent trends in higher education governance and then to speculate on the possible meaning of these trends for faculty members in general. The author contends that all the signs suggest that faculty members will continue to seek and to receive a significant role in institutional policy formation and decision making. The debate over whether faculty should share the power is no longer at issue according to Ikenberry. The real questions revolve around the matters or areas most appropriate for heavy faculty involvement, the levels within and beyond the institution at which the involvement will take place, and the means through which faculty will be involved. In short, the opening up or democratization of colleges and universities, especially two-year colleges, will likely require that administrators adopt new patterns of behavior and accommodate to new authority relationships, but, in addition, faculty also will have to accommodate themselves to less autonomy in decision making.

Liebert, R.J. & Bayer, A.E. Goals in teaching undergraduates professional reproduction and client-centeredness. The american sociologist, 10, November, 1975, 195-205.

During the second half of the 1972-73 academic year, the American Council on Education undertook a national general-purpose survey of college and university personnel. Questionnaires were mailed to 108,722 faculty and staff listed as employees in a nationally stratified sample of 301 institutions. Analyses were made of an item in the ACE questionnaire which read, "How important is each of the following: a) your personal goal or aim in teaching of undergraduate students, and b) your institution's goal in undergraduate education?" The findings for all senior college faculty revealed a mixed emphasis on professional and client-centered goals that is largely in keeping with Clark Kerr's portrayal of the multifaceted nature of higher education. Among the primary goals, receiving overwhelming support by faculty in their own teaching, are the three general items pertaining to the development of

students' basic intellectual competencies for clarity of thought, self-directed learning, and creativity, each of which was considered to be highly important by over three-quarters of all faculty members. Social science faculty members were found to be more professionally centered than were faculty members in general. In sociology, none of the client goals were ranked above any of the professional goals. In sociology, the proportion indicating an institutional commitment to training for employment and for community service was nearly twice as great as the proportion indicating a personal commitment in these areas. This was in accord with the hypothesis advanced in the study of a particularly sharp ideological contrast between faculty and institutional outlooks as reported by teachers of sociology. In conclusion, the authors state that in time, a greater emphasis on vocational and community service goals will likely develop in sociology. This will be particularly likely if the discipline continues to be an attractive undergraduate field, seeks to develop new nontraditional markets for its products, and declines to impose some "family planning" on the reproduction of teaching Ph.D.s. Additionally, there is still the prospect of a client's reform of teaching if institutional policy-makers continue to place mounting emphasis on accountability to clients and to diminish their concern with purely professional matters.

Reid, S.T. & Bates, A.P. Undergraduate sociology programs in accredited colleges and universities. The American sociologist, 6, May, 1971, 165-175.

In response to the establishment of a committee of the ASA to investigate the problem of undergraduate teaching, the authors undertook a nation i study of undergraduate curriculum and some related influences. The population for the study consisted of all four-year schools categorized in part 3 of the Higher Education Directory. A fifty percent sample was chosen to include 547 institutions. In addition to a review of the university catalogues, data were selected from two forms of questionnaires sent to teaching personnel in sample schools. One form, to be completed by the chairman only, contained questions on the undergraduate sociology program at his university. The second form, sent in duplicate and to be completed by the chairman and a second member of the sociology teaching staff, contained questions on attitudes toward the undergraduate sociology program. In institutions that had more than two persons teaching sociology, the second copy of the form was to be completed by the person who had most recently attended graduate school. The majority of the article was devoted to an in-depth analysis of the course offerings and their relationship to institutional control, level of training in the institution, and school size. The questionnaires sent to teachers of sociology included a question about the goals of undergraduate instruction. Six possible goals were listed, and respondents were asked to place in rank-order only those goals on the list that seemed to them proper and important. In addition, they were requested to develop a second rank-ordering of the same goals as reflected in the present programs of their colleges. The results indicated that most teachers who ranked the goals thought the most important goal of undergraduate instruction is "contributing to the liberal education of students regardless of major," and this was also the most important goal of existing programs according to the respondents. There was, furthermore, considerable agreement that preprofessional training in sociology is the second most important goal, except that non-Ph.D.s indicated that it was the third most important objective in their departmental programs (after pre-professional social work training). The conclusions of the authors suggested a continuing re-examination of the teaching of sociology. Also the survey concluded that there is some inherent tension between the three goals of undergraduate sociology education: 1) the goals of general education, 2) preprofessional training for sociologists, and 3) preprofessional training for social workers and persons in other professions.

C. Two-Year Institutions: The Academic Department/Division and the Department/Division Chair

Blomerley, P. The junior college department and academic governance. Junior college journal, 41, February, 1971, 38-40. [See B.I. Academic Organization and Administration: The Department/Division.]

Freligh, E.A. An investigation of the qualifications, methods of selection, and terms of office of department and division chairmen in selected public two-year colleges in the United States. Dissertation abstracts, 1973, 2959-A. [See A.IV. The Department Chair: Selection and Evaluation.]

Kiernan, I.R. The new style in college administration? Junior college journal, 38, September, 1967, 22-23. [See A.IV. The Department Chair: Selection and Evaluation.]

Koehnline, W.A. & Blocker, C.E. The division chairman in the community college. Junior college journal, 40, February, 1970, 9-12. [See A.III. The Department Chair: Role and Functions.]

O'Grady, J.P. The department chairman. Improving college and university teaching, 21, Autumn, 1973, 270-272. The same research is reported in The role of the department chairman. Junior college journal, 41, February, 1971, 33-36. [See A.III. The Department Chair: Role and Functions.]

Ravetch, H.W. Responsibilities, activities, and attitudes of selected southern california community college department/division chairmen. Dissertation abstracts, 1972, 5522-A. [See A.II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Smith, A.B. Department chairmen: neither fish nor fowl. Junior college journal, 42, March, 1972, 40-43. [See A.II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Smith, G. (Ed.) In search of leaders. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967. [See A.IV. The Department Chair: Selection and Evaluation.]

Stull, W.A. An exploratory study of the role of division chairmen in the virginia community college system. Dissertation abstracts, 1974, 224-225-A. [See A.II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]

Turner, K.S. The administrative role of the department chairman in florida public community colleges. Dissertation abstracts, 1973. [See A.II. The Department Chair: Perceptions of the Office.]